

814 Indicate Exactly How Application Is To Be Restricted

**SPECIES**

The mode of indicating how to require restriction between species is set forth in MPEP §809.02(a).

As pointed out in Ex parte Ljungstrom, 1905 C.D. 541, 119 O.G. 2335 (Comm'r Pat. 1905), the particular limitations in the claims and the reasons why such limitations are considered to restrict the claims to a particular disclosed species should be mentioned if necessary to make the requirement clear.

In view of the foregoing, more information is needed on what the Examiner considers the separate species in order for Applicant to properly respond to the election requirement. In addition, Applicant would argue that claim 77 is generic to species 5 and 6, such that upon allowance of claim 77, rejoinder of claims 83-90 will be requested. In this regard, claims 77-82 and claims 83-90 are directed to a test method using a probe card configured as shown in Figure 7B, with spring loaded electrical connectors 42 for applying a biasing force and test signals.

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 44-90 is respectfully requested. An IDS is being filed concurrently with this Response. Should any issues arise that will advance this case to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned by telephone.

DATED this 28th day of February, 2003.



Respectfully submitted:

Stephen A. Gratton  
Registration No. 28,418  
Attorney for Applicants

2764 S. Braun Way  
Lakewood, CO 80228  
Telephone: (303) 989-6353  
FAX (303) 989-6538

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, BOX AMENDMENT (NON FEE), Washington, D.C. 20231 on this 28th day of February, 2003.

February 28, 2003  
Date of Signature

Stephen A. Gratton  
Attorney for Applicants